Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 1 of 7 PAGEID #: 902

### Exhibit C

# IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO WESTERN DIVISION

HOBART CORPORATION, et al.,	) CASE NO. 3:10-CV-195
Plaintiffs,	) ) JUDGE WALTER HERBERT RICE
VS.	
WASTE MANAGEMENT OF OHIO, INC., et al.,	PLAINTIFFS' OBJECTIONS AND RESPONSES TO DEFENDANT
Defendants.	<ul><li>CARGILL, INCORPORATED'S FIRST</li><li>REQUEST FOR THE PRODUCTION</li><li>OF DOCUMENTS TO PLAINTIFFS</li></ul>

Pursuant to Rules 33 and 34 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Hobart Corporation, Kelsey-Hayes Company, and NCR Corporation ("Plaintiffs"), hereby provide the following Objections and Responses to Defendant Cargill, Incorporated's ("Defendant Cargill") First Request for the Production of Documents.

## **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

- 1. Plaintiffs object to these Requests to the extent that they call for the disclosure of documents that are protected by the attorney-client privilege, the work product doctrine, or any other applicable protection or claim of privilege.
- 2. Plaintiffs object to all Requests insofar as they attempt to impose obligations beyond those required by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.
- 3. Plaintiffs object to any and all Requests to the extent that they are unduly burdensome and overly broad.

Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 2 of 7 PAGEID #: 903

#### Exhibit C

- 4. Plaintiffs object to any and all Requests to the extent that they seek information or documents that are neither relevant to the subject matter of this action nor reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence.
- 5. Plaintiffs object to any and all Requests to the extent that they purport to require Plaintiffs to produce documents held by third parties or that are otherwise outside Plaintiffs' possession, custody or control.
- 6. Plaintiffs object to any and all Requests to the extent that they call for the reproduction of confidential and proprietary business information or documents without the parties' agreement as to a reasonable confidentiality agreement and/or protective order.
- 7. Plaintiffs reserve the right to supplement, clarify, revise or correct any of its responses in the event that Plaintiffs develop additional information through discovery or other pretrial preparation.
- 8. Plaintiffs incorporate each of these general objections into each response below and all responses below are made subject to and without waiver of these objections.
- 9. Plaintiffs object to the instructions set forth by Cargill to the extent they seek to alter or expand the duties imposed on Plaintiffs under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. In responding to these requests, Plaintiffs will comply with the applicable requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure.

### REQUESTS

1. Produce all documents which either relate to or provide any basis for the assertion(s) contained in Paragraph 30 of the First Amended Complaint.

Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 3 of 7 PAGEID #: 904

#### Exhibit C

### **RESPONSE**

Plaintiffs object to this Request on the basis that it is overly broad, unduly burdensome and not reasonably calculated to lead to the discovery of admissible evidence. Further, this Request seeks a disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege and or the attorney work product doctrine. Subject to and without waiving the foregoing general and specific objections, Plaintiffs state that they have produced all of the non-privileged documents currently in their possession, custody, or control that provide the factual basis for Plaintiffs' claims against Cargill, Inc. or are otherwise responsive to this Request. See Plaintiffs Rule 26(a)(1) Initial Disclosures. This includes but is not limited to the following documents:

<u>Document</u>	Bates Number
Ohio EPA inter-office communication dated April 19, 1979 from Joe Moore to Dick Carlton regarding Cargill, Inc.'s history of indiscriminate dumping of its "sludge" along ditches, fence lines, etc.	SDD_00207
Letter dated March 24, 1980 from John H. Bindeman of the Montgomery County Combined General Health District to Russell A. Gilmore, III of The Peerless Transportation Co., regarding the transportation of fly ash from Cargill, Inc. to the Site	SDD_00203-204
Letter dated January 14, 1983 from Joe Moore of Ohio EPA to Terry Wright of the Montgomery County Combined General Health District regarding a complaint as to the dumping of Cargill, Inc.'s waste near Valley Asphalt headquarters on Dryden Road in 1982	SDD_00206
Ohio EPA inter-office communication dated January 19, 1983 from Joe Moore to Valerie Brinker referring to Cargill, Inc., Needmore Rd., Montgomery County, and stating "This company has a history of indiscriminate dumping of its waste sludge. The latest complaint concerns the open dumping of their material off 1901 Dryden Road"	SDD_00205

Plaintiffs further respond that discovery regarding the responsibility and activities attributed to each of the Defendants is ongoing.

Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 4 of 7 PAGEID #: 905

### Exhibit C

2. Produce all documents which either relate to or provide any basis for the assertion(s) contained in Paragraph 45 of the First Amended Complaint.

### **RESPONSE**

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their Response to Request No. 1.

3. Produce all documents which relate or refer to the disposal of waste allegedly generated by Cargill during the time period set forth in the definitions.

## **RESPONSE**

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their Response to Request No. 1.

4. Produce all documents which relate or refer to Cargill's generation or alleged generation of waste during the time period set forth in the definitions.

### **RESPONSE**

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their Response to Request No. 1.

5. Produce all documents which related or refer to the transportation of waste allegedly generated by Cargill during the time period set forth in the definition.

### RESPONSE

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their Response to Request No. 1.

6. Produce all documents which relate or refer to the nature or makeup of the waste allegedly generated by Cargill during the time period set forth in the definitions, including but not limited to any chemical or physical analyses or photographs of the waste.

Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 5 of 7 PAGEID #: 906

### Exhibit C

# **RESPONSE**

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their Response to Request No. 1.

7. Produce all documents containing any information responsive to any of Cargill's First Set of Interrogatories to Plaintiffs.

# **RESPONSE**

Plaintiffs hereby incorporate their Response to Request No. 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Michael A. Cyphert, Esq. (0007086) - Trial Attorney

Leslie G. Wolfe, Esq. (0072838)

WALTER & HAVERFIELD LLP

The Tower at Erieview

1301 East Ninth Street, Suite 3500

Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Phone: (216) 781-1212

Email: mcyphert@walterhav.com

lwolfe@walterhav.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 6 of 7 PAGEID #: 907

### Exhibit C

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

The undersigned hereby certifies that a copy of the foregoing has been served via email and regular U.S. mail this 22<sup>nd</sup> day of April, 2011 upon Jack Allen Van Kley and Christopher Allen Walker, Van Kley and Walker, LLC, 132 Northwoods Blvd., Suite C-1, Columbus, OH 43235 (jvankley@vankleywalker.com, cwalker@vankleywalker.com) and Mark D. Erzen, Mark D. Erzen, P.C., 321 North Clark Street, Fifth Floor, Chicago, Illinois 60654-4769 (mark.erzen@erzenlaw.com), counsel for Defendant Cargill, Inc., and via email only upon the following:

Vicki J. Wright Krieg DeVault One Indiana Square, Suite 2800 Indianapolis, IN 46204-2079 vwright@kdlegal.com

Counsel for Defendant Pharmacia Corp. f/k/a Monsanto Company f/k/a Monsanto Research Company

John Paul Brody William H. Harbeck Kegler Brown Hill & Ritter 65 E. State Street, Suite 1800 Columbus, OH 43215 jbrody@keglerbrown.com

William H. Harbeck Quarles & Brady LLP 411 East Wisconsin Ave., Suite 2040 Milwaukee, WI 53202 william.harbeck@quarles.com

Counsel for Defendant Waste Management of Ohio

Case: 3:13-cv-00115-WHR Doc #: 106-3 Filed: 06/13/13 Page: 7 of 7 PAGEID #: 908

### Exhibit C

Frank L. Merrill
Drew H. Campbell
Anthony M. Sharett
Bricker & Eckler
100 S. Third Street
Columbus, OH 43215
fmerrill@bricker.com
dcampbell@bricker.com
asharett@bricker.com

Counsel for Dayton Power and Light Company

Martin H. Lewis Tucker Ellis & West LLP 1150 Huntington Building 925 Euclid Avenue Cleveland, OH 44115 mlewis@tuckerellis.com

Counsel for Valley Asphalt Corporation

David T. Moss Hanna Campbell & Powell 3737 Embassy Parkway Akron, OH 44333 Dmoss@hcplaw.net

William Wick
Wactor and Wick, LLP
Suite 950
100 Grand Ave.
Oakland, CA 94612
bwick@ww-envlaw.com

Counsel for Bridgestone Firestone Inc.

Leslie G. Wolfe

One of the attorneys for the Plaintiffs